DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 770 SO 012 803

AUTHOR Clavner, Jerry B.: Sumodi, Veronica R.
TITLE Followership in Ecology/Environment Social Movements.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 27p.: Paper presented at the Capon Springs Conference (4th, Philadelphia, PA, February 22-24, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conservation (Environment): *Ecology: Energy Conservation: *Environment: Futures (of Society): Group Behavior: Leadership Responsibility: *Majority Attitudes: *Negative Attitudes: *Social Action: *Social Problems

ABSTRACT

The paper analyzes the failure of the ecology/environmental movement to develop into a social movement and to generate a mass following. The movement has had difficulty not only in organizing collective behavior but also in maintaining the necessary momentum to change into a full-fledged social movement. Obvious reasons are that ecologists conflict with pressure groups, big business, and capitalistic industries. Also, the mode of thinking in the United States is characterized by the frontier mentality. People do not accept the fact that environmental deterioration is irreversible: many point to the possibility of a technological breakthrough and suggest that great American know-how pulls us out of any crisis. In addition, society has institutionalized the idea of growth. To change this type of thinking requires strong leadership and a committed, active followership. One of the major problems is that the ecology/environmental movement is preceived as fragmented and unable to coalesce its own common interests. Finally, the media, although not antagonistic, do not appear to support the movement because it is not perceived as leading to a positive change of society. Its goals are perceived as unattainable or attainable only with a great deal of sacrifice and participation in the movement is in the form of leisure time, disposable income activities. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191770

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jerry B. Clavner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FOLLOWERSHIP IN ECOLOGY/ENVIRONMENT SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

A PAPER FOR PRESENTATION

CAPON SPRINGS CONFERENCE IV
PHILADELPHIA, PA.
FEBRUARY 22-24, 1980

SP 012 803

Jerry B. Clavner, Ph.D.
Veronica R. Sumodi, R.N.

This paper would commonly be called a theoretical description, but may be more aptly considered a series of hypothetical explanations. Questions, issues, and relationships are raised with few real answers. This paper is addressed to three readers: the leader of an ecology/environment organization, the student of social movements, and the individual who might be or want to be both. The leader must test the hypothesis with his/her own experience. The sociologist must determine whether the extrapolations of theory are correct. The potential change agent must devise action research to test the hypothesis and apply the results to the organization, to development, and, hopefully, eventual dissolution of the ecology/environment movement.

The question of this paper is: "Why have ecology/environment problems of the 70's and 80's not developed into social issues and not generated a mass following in comparison with other social concerns of the recent past?" In order to answer the question, the writer will use the sociological theory that deals with collective behavior and social movements. There may be other ways of explaining the phenomenon, but the perspective used here appears well suited for dealing with the process of social change.

Allow me to state my biases (limitations) at the outset. The issues of ecology/environment only recently came to be my personal concern. Nothing in my background in school, at home, or work experience predisposed me to dealing with the issues. The "breakthru", if you would call it that, came during a year's work and study in Israel and travel in Europe. The ability of the Israelis to conserve, positively utilize, and make a basically harsh, unhospitable environment, actually pleasing contrasted sharply with the cities of Naples, Marseilles, Athens and Le Havre.

Later, my internship in the social movements of the 60's and my academic and professional career directed me toward curing the ills of the urban area. For me, the questions of aesthetics, orderliness, and openness became touch stones (panaceas?) for the problems of the modern metropolis, especially in the area of education. After the ebbing of the "crisis" forced by the 1973-74 oil embargo, it became obvious that a mass movement or collective conscience had not developed around the ecology/environment, be it in the metropolitan areas or elsewhere. Almost ten years have passed since the first Earth Day, 22 April, 1970. We now import three times the oil we did ten years ago. There have been significant interruptions of electrical service in this country. The national parks are overcrowded. At least one nuclear power plant has been put out of commission. Many more species of life have been added to the endangered list. The newspapers are full of articles on energy, ecology, and environment, yet we do not appear to have progressed at all in solving the problems. Why? As Pogo said in a different (?) context; "We have met the enemy, and they is us."

One of the first questions this paper must raise is to ask whether there really is an issue, not necessarily a problem, but is the problem perceived by by either a significant portion or segment of the population or a sufficient number of opinion leaders/ those with access to the mass media to create an issue from the problem. It would appear at first blush that the question is almost ridiculous. No one, but the most hard core anti-environmentalists believe that the lack of natural resources, contamination and pollution, and energy depletion is not a fact, or do they ? But the question is not one of facts, but attitudes that lead to action.

We must make ourselves understand, while some of us believe there is a problem, and we can muster data to support our belief, and while it should appear obvious that there is such a problem, it does not follow that people will follow thru and act upon it, that is, make it an issue.

A social movement exists when a group of individuals are engaged in an organized effort either to change or maintain some element of the larger society. Social movements differ from the elementary forms of collective behavior [elemental form of aggregate behavior (such as a mob)] in that they are more tightly organized and have a life span that is considerably longer. The primary difference between the social movement and the institution is the permanence of the institution compared to the temporary nature of the social movement.(1) Social movement is an ongoing collective effort with focused goals and articulated tactics to promote or resist social change.

Collective behavior takes place when formalized, traditional means of doing things are no longer adequate. Collective behavior is characterized by unstructured, spontaneous, emotional, and unpredictable patterns of behavior. Individuals who are involved in collective behavior respond to a particular stimulus which may be either another person or a specific event.(2) Collective behavior is the actions of temporary, unstructured groups of people who are focused on and reacting to the same event, rumor, person, group, or custom.

Circular reaction is Blumer's term for a phenomenon in which people react immediately and directly to an action, thereby encouraging the original actors to continue their behavior.(3)

(1) Bruce J. Cohen, Schaum's Outline of Theory and Problems of Introduction to Sociology, McGraw-Hill (Schaum's Outline Series), New York, 1979, pg. 195.

(2) Bruce J. Cohen, pg. 153.

(3) Light, Donald, Jr. and Suzanne Heller, Sociology, 2nd Ed., Alfred Knopf, New York, 1979, pg. 540.

One of the problems of analysis revolves around the definitions given above as they impact social science thinking. Collective behavior is viewed as unorganized, spontaneous, and irrational. Yet, social movements are seen as highly organized, goal directed and patterned. While both of these descriptions are correct given their assumptions, the process of change from collective behavior to social movement is not adequately analyzed in the literature. Collective behavior actually has two segments which sometimes blend into each other or turn into each other.

Segment one, we would rather call, aggregate behavior. Typical manifestations include mobs, riots, crazes, and panics. The second segment is collective behavior, where there is at least a temporary identification with a leader, goal, or process as in rallies, protests, fashions, and extraordinary phenomena. It might even be hypothesized that in a mass-mediated society like ours there is even a in-between segment in which the aggregate becomes a public (read audience) before it can be transformed into a collective.

Once collective behavior is viewed as a complex process in this manner, it is easier to see some of the difficulties that the ecology/environment movement has in stimulating aggregate behavior, organizing collective behavior as well as maintaining the momentum and importance of the issue necessary to facilitate the change to a full-fledged social movement.

People in the ecology/environment movement and the social scientists would agree that there must be an object against which collective behavior

is directed. They would also contend, I would venture to interpolate, that if the original reason for the behavior is removed (or in Freud's case, displaced) then another object of concern must be perceived if the collective behavior or social movement is to actively survive.

It is true that both collective behavior and social movements often survive "the solving of the problem," but they do so in a form different and less effective than previously possessed, i.e., as political parties or cadres, mutual benefit or social associations, non-profit organizations, or as totally co-opted segments of the major institutions.

Some may object to the death knell analysis of the movements with the perceived and projected emphasis on legislative lobbying, but the inability to either effect the desired changes or maintain a high level of active involvement will significantly reduce the public's knowledge and possible conversion to the ecology/environment movement. Thus, even if certain legislative changes are made, much can negate even the best laws.

I think that most of the major theoreticians of collective behavior and social movements (LeBon, Freud, Blumer and Smelser) would agree (Freud might demur) that horrendous objective social conditions (please note the word social, an issue to which we will return) are necessary but not significant reasons/causes for the development of collective behavior or social movements. There must be the perception of radical change, generally in the form of marked deterioration to stimulate the interaction among individuals who perceive themselves as adversely affected. Such a perception of change could possibly lead to collective participation and a concentrated effort aimed at organization to ameliorate the effects of the condition or to change the situation. One cannot assume that collective behavior is the inevitable result of the perception of a problem or even an issue.

As early as 1970, Richard Saltonstall, Jr., then with Time Magazine, set

the tone by indicating that collective behavior is expensive, an uphill battle against large interest groups, and often frustrating.(4) The need for governmental action is clearly put forward, but nowhere does the author indicate what can be done when governmental action is circumvented, negated, or ignored. Also, the writers do not tell us what to do when contradicting actions and inactions at all governmental levels increase the inability to get things done. Governmental inability to direct national action is a result of the contradictions perceived by the citizenry. While there do not appear to be any inherent negatives - how can anyone be against the environment? - the pressure groups; energy vs environment, technology vs natural, progress vs conservation have not helped governmental action to appear to be in anyway reflective of a policy which would develop out of a consistency of "in-put."

But it is not simply "nasty" pressure groups, big business and the capitalistic industries, the ecology/environmental organizations and associations have spent a great deal of time and energy talking to themselves. Terms like ecosystem, biomass, ionosphere, sinks, seral disturbance are simply not heard by the population in general. To add to that, the emphasis of much publicity has been to give the public the impression that restoration of the environment is impossible; that rehabilitation of some sort of a less than optimum ecosystem is almost as unlikely and that the best that we can do is to slow the rate of consumption of resources or their deterioration. The cut-off or tip point in many areas has not or may not have been established by scientific means even with computer models until, quite often, it is too late. The doomsday prognosticators have already told us that it is too late, that the degradation of the entire biosphere/ecology is irreversible, that any conservation action merely delays the inevitable. The "me" generation which includes <u>all</u> those born since the hardest parts of the depression exhibits very little concern for future generations except in the area

(4) Richard Saltonstall, Jr., <u>Your Environment and What You Can Do About It</u>, New York: Walker and Co., 1970.

of personal property, personal space, and the mechanisms of obtaining both. The quality of life is more often than not defined in terms of the quantity of possessions in clear economic terms; land, labor, capital and technology. These classical components of economic inputs are viewed as in significant abundance as to offset any short term shortage in any one.

Our society is not ready to accept that the deterioration (if they perceive it at all and most don't) is irreversible; they certainly are not ready to accept their personal or collective responsibility; past, present, or future. To make the responsibility total and yet not allow the society to solve the problem by will and conviction only is antithetical to the accepted mode of thinking. To digress, it is an interesting question as to where and when this mode of thinking developed. The radicals would have us believe that it is endemic to our capitalistic/consumeristic society. The more conservative who understand the situation point to the last thirty years of relative affluence which has spurred unquenchable desires fueled by the advertisers and mass media. It is true that Fredrick Jackson Turner's theory of the frontier mentality still exists. Many in our society point to as yet undiscovered resources, the possibility of a technological breakthrough, significant changes in governmental policy and that great American know-how that always pulls us out of any crises.

It is also true enough that much of the current situation while with us for a long time has only been exacerbated since World War II. We must remember that the population of the U.S. did not reach 100 million until almost twenty years into the 20th Century, so that in one quarter of our two hundred year history, we have doubled the population it took us 150 years to reach. The issue of poulation and its place in the scheme of this is important in and of itself because it bears on the problem of why there is no large following for

the ecology/environment movement as a whole.

Population is an issue that the western world has latched on to with a janus' face. Population control has been advanced as a panacea for pollution of all sorts at least since the days of Malthus. It is allegedly a clearly quantifiable matter. It is also hypothetically one of the few independent variables. But population is a complex matter. It has religious, racial, political and economic components, but more important for our purposes here, it is an individual decision in our society. Governmental policy does not severely punish the overpopulators if they have the economic resources to support themselves. For those who don't have these resources, the issue is not clear, but certainly the few highly publicized attempts at population control among welfare recipients, indigents, and even certain criminals indicate our lack of societal committment to population control. Pressure groups and interest groups have fought against even the March of Dimes when it started a pre-natal counseling program. If a decision is made to limit the size of a family, it is an individual decision based upon individual rationale, often defined in selfish (not necessarily bad) terms. The decision is generally a relative one (less rather than more). Absolute steps are not taken by most, and even among those who do, the next generation has already been produced. The population base continues to increase, therefore there would have to be a substantial reduction in new births to have any effect.

Population is also a cyclical phenomena. Decisions made about population even collectively often cannot have a significant effect on other phenomena until other changes in the cycle have occurred, thus negating most long term influence. Population is also neither as independent a variable as we might have thought, nor is it as predictable as we thought. John Calhoun's "Social

Density and Social Pathology" has limited implications for urban living as long as humans feel that they are not part of a closed system.[5] While they are enclosed and maybe victims of their sociobiology, they do not experience themselves as such. Their perceptions as individuals set the blue print for their behavior by clustering their values, norms and beliefs in a manner that reinforces their preferred behavior. The world population increase rate is still 17% and with stepped up migration of the post Vietnam War era, population rate decline in the developed world has had no effect on reducing demand for resources.

In fact, the demand for resources with an increase in relative affluence could be viewed within a Malthusian framework. An arithmetic increase in population has produced a geometric increase in resource demand as a result of life style changes. A higher standard of living creates in the individual the desire to acquire and consume at a much higher rate. The geometric increase in quasi-choices in consumer goods has produced an obsolescence that few see as more than simply an inconvenience of modern society. The fact that it may be cheaper to replace something than to repair it is no longer viewed as a liability. Replaceability is synonomous with better, and better means personal growth.

In a society where the idea of growth means development in the most positive sense; where anything else is less than satisfactory or satisfying, the idea of no growth is not even perceived as an alternative.

Our society has institutionalized the idea of growth. "Small is Beautiful" is only a temporary condition; a vision of youth who have not yet toasted of the fruits of progress. Doing without is just that - without; the criteria by which we judge and the yardstick by which we measure is "having."

Those involved in ecology/environment issues are the inheritors of the

(5) John B. Calhoun, "Population Density and Social Pathology," Scientific American, 206(Feb., 1962), 139-148.

labeling of the 50's and the 60's which had those looking at long term issues as egg-heads, those who were in the forefront of the rights issues a different breed, both self-defined and perceived by the public. These latter saw immediate change from injustice as proof of man's basic goodness. But man's basic goodness is seen in rather narrow terms. To paraphrase Marcus Aurelius, we exist for one another when the other is close at hand. Either we accomodate or bear the burden of conflict. But only people conflict. Man and nature stand only in a superordinate/subordinate relationship. Man's task, according to one interpretation of Genesis, is to subjugate the land. And while the prophets in Israel, Judea, and after the fall of Rome decried the desolation of the land, it was political-religious rationale that was used to explain famines, floods, plagues, and barrenness, not man's lack of concern for proper conservation. If man would simply return to the proper service of God, then all would be right in the world. If this vignette was simply a part of our tradition, it would be quaint. But it is a significant residual in our thinking. To change this type of thinking requires strong leadership and a committed active followership.

No social movement will be successful without the presence of effective leaders. The movement's ideology and plan of action must apppeal to many non-movement people who share the problem in question and who have to be convinced to join. These people must be identified so the leaders' public appeal to them will result in their support, thus increasing the movement's membership and adding to its funds. In addition, effective leaders must maintain a sense of cohesion within a movement, making members constantly aware of their shared values and goals.

In order for a social movement to be successful it must have the support and loyalty of its members. This support is gathered and maintained in most instances through the use of propaganda, speeches, slogans, and ideologies. The

charismatic leader of a social movement has the ability to rally massess of people in support of the goals and objectives of the movement. The charismatic leader may be a member of the group attempting to promote change or may be a member of a more privileged class. The major function of the leader is to inspire enthusiasm among followers, arouse excitement, and encourage them to unite.

The role of the administrative leader is very different from the charismatic leader's. The administrative leader must be concerned with very practical matters, including the organization of the movement, the delegation of duties and responsibilities, recruitment, fundraising, and public relations.

This is especially important because participants in social movements tend to be peripheral to the modal community. Whether they are poorly integrated, avant garde, or deviant is mostly a function of who is labeling, but they are generally discontent personally and tend to view any change in which they might be a part as preferable to the status quo.

The leadership as well as the so-called hard core participants must understand how they are perceived by the population at large. On the one hand, there is a significant segment that retain the view of the ecology/environment organizations as ladies garden clubs, upper class dilettantism, animal protective leagues, and bird watchers. Many of the individuals promoted by the media are entertainment personalities, whom many Americans feel use causes to reinforce social status to go along with economic status that comes with popularity. For many members of our society who have not basked in the sunlight of affluence, (lower classes and minorities) doing with less or without is not even a question. While they may be in the long run the greatest beneficiaries of conservation, etc., they do not see "affording it."

From a different perspective, a significant segment of the population

see only the youth, the protests, interference with economic progress, sabotage, and a set of militant associations with more than a tinge of the Socialist/ Communist aura about them. Utopian movements have the disadvantage of being associated with socialist or communist tendencies or ideologies. As such, ideas that appear to be utopian in nature or have utopian ideals are minimally viewed as exclusive and exclusionary or in an extreme propagandized form, anti-capitalistic and therefore anti-American. One of the major problems confronting the movement is perceived from the outside, and that is, the fragmentation. The groups and organizations are seen as narrow, parochial, and mutually antagonistic (in both senses). The ecology/environment organizations are seen as proliferating, soliciting funds, and preaching armageddon and apocalypse for humped back whales, sea turtles, salamanders, or whatever. They are perceived as having tunnel vision in not being able to coalesce their own common interests.

We have consciously not defined ecology or environment. We also have not enumerated or named the organizations that could be considered part of the movement. It is not simply a matter of semantics. Ecology is a scientific are of study. It is not a thing or even a process. Eco-system or eco-statics are more proper terms. Environment is one (external) element in an eco-system. What the relationships are between the organisms and their environments is the field of ecology. As stated earlier, no one could be against the environment, but that is a matter of individual definition. The person who empties a car ashtray in a parking lot is defining his environment and therefore his ecology differently perhaps than the individual who does not smoke because smoking pollutes. It is not simply differences in definitions though, but relative knowledge or lack thereof that impedes many people from identifying with others who might be part of a collective.

Social movements, in the final analysis, must involve people; not necessarily large numbers of people (but that helps), but certainly numbers significant to make a difference. It is necessary that these individuals be willing to commit themselves to the expenditure of a great deal of their energy, time, emotions, and resources. This last may be the most important for our discussions, because commitment to a social movement may mean the relinquishing of opportunities to add to resources by employment in a more renumerative field or through additional time to engage in certain types of gainful employment.

Minimal tangential participation - leisure time association - is not what drives collective behavior. Thus, without getting into the area of psychodynamics, it is necessary to discuss motivation.(6)

Talcott Parsons states the issue:

> The obverse of the functional prerequisite of meeting a minimum proportion of the needs of the individual actors is the need to secure adequate participation of a sufficient proportion of these actors in the social system, that is to motivate them adequately to the performances which may be necessary if the social system in question is to persist or develope. (7)
>
> ...the significance of an action or class of them is to be understood not directly and primarily in terms of its motivation but of its actual or probable consequences for the system. (8)

Thus, power, privilege, and prestige must be enhanced individually, but within the framework of the collective. Individual pursuit of these goals may be counterproductive to the maintenance of the social movement. If the behavior of the individual does not receive the positive reinforcement of others or

(6) Neil Smelser, Theory of Collective Behavior. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963., passim.

(7) Talcott Parsons, The Social System. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1951., p. 29.

(8) Op. cit.

cannot be observed by those who would reinforce it, the behavior is not likely to persist. The persistance of motivation is a result of socialization. The first generation socializes the second not only to have the particular attitudes but socializes them that it is necessary to socialize the next generation that these attitudes are not only worthwhile having but are necessary for survival in the collective.

Participation im a collective in this light has a functional prerequisite of a "coming-together" for mutual reinforcement. Where geographic or issue dispersion negates against this "coming-together," development of increased collective participation is difficult to achieve. Most of the social movements of the 60's had at least the verbalization of the appropriate attitudes for almost the requisite number of generations (one of the problems of that era was that the second generation was still alive and it had not internalized the attitudes, thus the conflict). In the case of the ecology/environment movement, there is no such tradition; in fact, one can find examples of the opposition to it which have been socialized and internalized in the frontier and economic progress attitudes mentioned elsewhere in this paper.

In other social movements there have been certain stimulators to motivation, among these are religion and music. I am not here arguing that leaders or members of the various groups are anti-religious, but even the president's moral equivalent of war does not have the positive religious sanction that many of the social movements of the 60's had. It is interesting to note, again, not to denigrade the religious beliefs of the leadership, but historically from Thoreau to today the atmosphere of the environmentally minded has been pantheistic or theistic rather than within the institutionalized religions' frameworks or even within a new ecumenicism. There has been no appeal to a higher authority -God or the

Bible- for support or confirmation of the actions or goals of the movement, and except for protests against something nuclear, the number of clergy visible in the movement are relatively few.

With regard to music, aside from a new album, "No More Nukes," few of the pop singers are associated with the ecology/environment movement in their music. Even John Denver appears more of a pacifist than a proponent of the issues that matter. While certain performers are associated with particular causes, a jaded public and a lack of concentrated effort on the performers' part to provide expressive leadership has robbed the ecology/environment movement of a valuable tool.

How much of the participation or lack thereof in the movement is a function of the mass media's presentation of the issues probably cannot be determined. While this paper is not meant to discuss communications theory nor place blame, it is instructive to review some of the treatment of current situation relative to ecology/environment in the media. It should be noted at the outset that very little negative has been said relative to the conduct of the ecology/environment movement. The only major exception centers around the protest against the installation at Seabrook, N.H. by Clamshell Alliance and others. In most cases the media treatment has been one of sympathy rather than indignation (probably in part because most protests are unsuccessful). The second point that must be made concerns the confusion that is caused by combining energy, ecology, environment, profits, governmental ineptitude, foreign affairs, etc. (9) issues that appear in media discussions.

The third point revolves around advertisements. Aside from a few federal and state conservation commercials, advertising by the private sector and oil

(9) "Lag Cited in U.S. Action on Contaminated Poultry", New York Times, Sept.23, 1979, p. 25.

companies is slanted to convince people that they (the businesses) are doing the best they can to alleviate any conditions or situations that might aggravate the environment. At the same time they attempt to impress upon the individual consumer his or her responsibility to consume "carefully." While business, industry, utilities and government also pollute, but we are constantly reminded that we and our automobiles must bear the major part of the burden of guilt for the problem. Added to that is the direct threat that we, the consumer, will have to pay for anything that is done to correct the situation because we not only created the problem, but we made it into an issue.

Fourth, there is no identifiable class or culture issue. No particular group is singled out as the special victim of discrimination. As a result, many minorities, including Jews, Blacks, American Indian, and Chicano, who might contribute to the movement do not identify with the ecology/environment movement.*

Finally, with regard to editorial or investigative positions taken by the media in public issues, it does not appear that any of the major networks or newspapers have established policies that would support the movement to any extent. Their editorializing seems topical enough, but generally lacks depth and rarely shows any attempt to follow up on any particular issue unless it is "newsworthy."

A series of selected newspaper article headlines illustrates the media's "handling" of ecology/environmental issues. The articles

*The notable exceptions are the Eskimos and Aleutians.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

appeared in the New York Times (NYT) and the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer (CPD).

September 23, 1979 (NYT)

"157 at a Hospital Stricken by Salmonella Poisoning"

"Sewage Spill Wipes Out San Francisco Bay Fish"

"Lag Cited in U.S. Action on Contaminated Poultry"

"Texas Politics Feel Residue of Oil Spill"

September 26, 1979 (CPD)

"Tests can't expalin urnaium loss in Tenn."

"Anti-nuke forces plan to renew Vt. protests"

"Officials to test David-Besse evacuation plan"

Even the business oriented Wall Street Journal has trouble focusing

October 30, 1979

"Antinuclear Rallier's Bid to Halt Trading on Big Board Fizzles"

December 19, 1979

"Main Problem of the 1980s Will Involve Energy, Many Experts Think"

December 14,1979

"As Wood Fuel Gains for Heating Homes, So Does Pollution"

Two versions of the same article (?) illustrate the problems with media coverage of the issues. They are duplicated here:

From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, October 29, 1979.

Ecology's birthplace

'At daybreak, I am the sole owner of all the acres I can walk over.'

"There are some who can live without wild things, and some who cannot." Thus begins Aldo Leopold's "Sand County Alamanac," the "bible" of the ecology movement. In respect thereof, there is the Aldo Leopold Memorial Reserve, 1,300 living acres for those who cannot live without wild things.

By Dion Henderson

BARABOO, Wis. (AP) — The pioneer wagon track is blacktopped now. The trees the young people planted cast disorienting shadows on the sand. But in the clearing, the Shack looks exactly as it did 30 years ago.

It looks as though you might sit on the oaken bench beside the door in early morning, and Aldo Leopold might come out with a notebook and a pot of coffee, and wait for the first robin to chirp from the crotch of the elm tree, and thus you would know that one-tenth of a foot candle of light had come to the land.

Perhaps on a morning such as this, he wrote in his notebook, "At daybreak, I am the sole owner of all the acres I can walk over. It is not only boundaries that disappear, but also the thought of being bounded."

This is where those words were written. In this spot. There is a boulder nearby, where two sentences cast in bronze attest to it:

"It is here that we seek — and still find — our meat from God."

And it was here that Aldo Leopold filled the journals that became the book that was — and still is — the bible of the ecological movement.

"A Sand County Almanac, and Sketches Here and There" it was called by an academic publisher, and at first, in 1949, it doubtless was read by academics.

But long since, there must be scarcely any stripe of environmentalist who cannot look you in the eye and quote the simple declaration with which it opens:

"There are some who can live without wild things, and some who cannot."

Leopold came at last to compiling the almanac, which also included the episodes that he "taught me gradually and sometimes painfully that the company is out of step," and concluded with the towering postulates of the Land Ethic, at the climax of a 40-year career in

A native of Iowa and a graduate of Yale, he began his work as a federal forester in the Southwest, and in 15 years became chief operations officer for Arizona and New Mexico. He helped formulate the national forest policy and came to Wisconsin as associate director of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison.

Then for several years he was a consultant on wildlife populations, and finished "Game Management," a monumental book that established a new science and introduced the nomenclature of environmental manipulation into the language.

Then, in 1933, the University of Wisconsin created a chair in wildlife management for him, and he moved into the academic world.

Two years later, on a snowy February day, he loaded his wife, Estella, and five teen-aged children into the family automobile and churned northwest from Madison on a diminishing trail to a windswept clearing whose only building was what eventually came to be known as the most famous chicken shed in North America.

Nina Leopold Bradley, one of the five kids who pushed the car through the drifts that day, still remembers when the family stood in the snowy clearing of that farm whose worn sands seemingly could support only marsh grass and weeds, wondering what their father saw in the place.

The children, she says, knew that he was driven by convictions they could only vaguely understand — "never more vaguely than that day in the snow."

That was the very heart of the idea, it turned out.

It has all changed now, with a magnitude unimaginable 30 years ago.

The Aldo Leopold Memorial Reserve now encompasses 1,300 acres bound together by landowners who have taken steps to see that their holdings are forever managed by a unit.

Financial help comes from the L.R. Head Foundation, named after Reid Coleman's grandfather, a pioneer physician, and others. A Coleman family cabin has been restored on a hillside where the Leopold Fellowship scholars live in the summer while they compile studies of the reserve.

A string of wildlife ponds dots the body of the marsh and there are resident populations of various ducks, small birds and animals and a substantial herd of deer. And, of course, the great migratory flights of geese stop here in numbers, filling the sky with the music Leopold cherished.

Mixed hardwoods have joined the stalwart oaks that first took command of the banks and ridges, and some of the most impressive work has come in a great burst after the first burning following the removal of diseased trees that had kept their slope in shade for 70 years.

The reserve is not open to the public; it was, after all, designed as a relic wild community preserving what had been lost elsewhere beneath too many feet, too many wheels.

There are only a few footsteps here now, and no recreational wheels; no snowmobiles, no four-wheel drive vehicles, no motorcycles. Even the precise location of the reserve is kept vague, and maps are restricted, to keep off poaching and vandalism, since the area has grown too great to be patrolled.

And likely it will grow even greater, and more quickly now with the maturing of the environmental movement.

Nina Leopold Bradley, who with her husband, retired gelogist Charles Bradley, live on the resrve and guide the scholarship, wonders sometimes about what her father would think of the changes.

There is, of course, no way to tell. Aldo Leopold died in April of 1948, helping fight a brush fire that got out of hand on nearby Plummer's Marsh. That was five weeks after he had written the introduction to the almanac, and while it was still in manuscript.

He never saw the restored marsh or the little book that has gone marching on.

Wisconsin Nature Reserve Begun in 30's Still Thriving

BARABOO, Wis., Oct. 27 (AP) — The pioneer wagon track is blacktopped now, but in the early light the shack looks as it did 30 years ago when Aldo Leopold, sitting on the oak bench beside the door with a notebook and coffee, wrote the journals that became the bible of the ecological movement.

"At daybreak," he wrote, perhaps on such a morning, "I am the sole owner of all the acres I can walk over. It is not only boundaries that disappear, but also the thought of being bounded."

The journals were published in 1949 as "A Sand County Almanac, and Sketches Here and There." There is scarcely an environmentalist who cannot quote the opening passage: "There are some who can live without wild things, and some who cannot."

Mr. Leopold compiled the almanac, which concluded with the postulates of the land ethic, at the end of a 40-year career in conservation.

Changes in Career

A native of Iowa and a Yale graduate, he worked as a Federal forester in the Southwest and in 15 years became chief operations officer for Arizona and New Mexico.

He helped formulate the national forest policy and came to Wisconsin as associate director of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison. For several years he was a consultant on wildlife populations and finished "Game Management," a monumental book that established a new science and introduced the nomenclature of environmental manipulation into the language.

In 1933, the University of Wisconsin created a chair in wildlife management for him, and he moved into the academic world.

Two years later, he loaded his wife, Estella, and five teen-age children into the family automobile and churned northwest on a snowy February day from Madison on a diminishing trail to a windswept clearing whose only building came to be known as the most famous chicken shed in North America.

Understanding of Children

The children, says a daughter, Nina Leopold Bradley, knew that he was driven by convictions they could only vaguely understand — "never more vaguely than that day in the snow."

"Nothing could be more salutary at this stage," Mr. Leopold wrote in the almanac, "than a little healthy contempt for a plethora of material blessings."

And again: "On this sand farm in Wisconsin, first worn out and then abandoned by our bigger and better society, we try to rebuild, with shovel and ax, what we are losing elsewhere."

At any rate, this was how it began, with 80 acres of worn-out sand and stony ridges and marsh.

It has all changed now. The Aldo Leopold Memorial Reserve encompasses 1,300 acres bound together by landowners who have taken steps to see that their holdings are forever managed by a unit. Financial help comes from the L.R. Head Foundation, named after a pioneer physician, and others. In a restored cabin the Leopold Fellowship scholars live in the summer while they compile studies of the reserve's biota.

Ducks, Deer and Geese

Wildlife ponds dot the body of the marsh where various ducks, small birds and animals and a substantial herd of deer reside. Migratory flights of geese fill the sky with the sounds Mr. Leopold cherished.

The reserve is not open to the public; it was designed as a wild community preserving what had been lost elsewhere beneath too many feet, too many wheels. There are only a few footsteps now, and no recreational wheels, no snowmobiles, no four-wheel-drive vehicles, no motorcycles. Even the precise location of the reserve is kept vague, and maps are restricted, to prevent poaching and vandalism, since the area is too great to be patrolled.

Nina Leopold Bradley, who with her husband, Charles Bradley, a retired geologist, lives on the reserve and guides the scholarship and wonders what her father would think of the changes.

Aldo Leopold died in April 1948, helping fight a brush fire that got out of hand on nearby Plummer's Marsh. That was five weeks after he wrote the introduction to the almanac, while it was still in manuscript.

He never saw the revitalized marsh, the growing trees or the little book that has gone marching on.

The Shack, northwest of Madison, Wis., where Mr. Leopold lived and wrote

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One cannot easily point to a single process or phenomenon and label it as the reason that problems of the environment/ecology have not become an issue. There are a complex of historical and social reasons, and that is part of the topic we have addressed in this paper. Reviewing, the frontier mentality, the capitalistic/consumer society, the deux ex machina of technology and the perceived amorphous nature of the problems are but a few of the reasons.

The crux of the issue is that the ecology/environmental movement is not a social movement. It is not perceived as leading to a positive change in the functioning, make up, or structure of society. Its goals, while for the most part admirable, are either perceived as unattainable or attainable only with great sacrifice to the individual and the commonweal. The emphasis of the movement on correcting the evils of this and past generations does not ring true to those who cannot see the life envisioned by the movement's proponents as desirable. In order for people to join and actively support a social movement, the goals must be clearly defined in personal terms. This does not mean that the individual must derive immediate gratification or even direct personal benefit, but he/she must be able to see that by adding his/her voice, energy, money and enthusiasm, something of social consequence will be accomplished within a reasonable period of time.

If we were to look at all of the organizations, groups, and associations involved in the ecology/environment movement, we would

have to acknowledge that most if not all have valid issues with which to deal. Occasionally they are able to form coalitions to attack particular problems where their goals and missions are complementary. Coalitions, though, are shakey alliances and their ability to withstand external pressure and internal conflict is generally low. The structuring of long term coalitions, even at the leadership level has rarely occurred.

The continuation of specificity of goals, local and objective, may actually work against the development of a social (mass) movement. While a specific problem or irritant is necessary for the initiation of aggregate behavior, continued specificity cats to detract from the possibility of amalgamation and collectivization of individuals who might be interested in a more general issue.

Participation in collective behavior for most people is a form of associating, that is, a leisure time/disposable income type of activity. Protesters and picketers cannot or will not be able to maintain total commitment without the sense of personal and collective success. The leadership of ecology/environment organizations must understand this and organize to maximize the potential for collectivization, even if it means relinquishing organizational autonomy. We can ill afford to continue attempting to solve ecology/environment problems on a leisure time/disposable income basis, there is no disposable time left.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cohen, Bruce J. Schaum's Outline of Theory and Problems of Introduction to Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Fletcher, Max E. Economics and Social Problems. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. The Nature of Mass Poverty. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Garvey, Gerald. Energy, Ecology, Economy. New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

Light, Donald, Jr. and Suzanne Heller. Sociology. 2nd ed. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1979.

Miller, Roger Leroy. Economics Today. Brief Edition, Second Ed., San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1976.

Mitchell, John G. Losing Ground. San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1975.

Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1951.

Phillips, Owen M. The Last Energy Book. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Saltonstall, Richard, Jr. Your Environment and What you can do about it. New York: Walker and Co., 1970.

Smelser, Neil. Theory of Collective Behavior. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

United States. Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality. Citizens Make the Difference. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

Wagner, Richard H. Environment and Man. 3rd ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 1978.

Ward, Barbara. The Home of Man. New York: W.W. Norton, 1976.

Articles & Pamphlets

Calhoun, John B. "Population Density and Social Pathology," Scientific American, 206(Feb., 1962), 139-148.

Community and Junior College Journal. "Energy and the Way We Live -- An Issues Calendar," Community and Junior College Journal 50 (Oct., 1979), 15-22.

"Energy Savings Through Automatic Thermostat Controls," Energy Research and Development Administration and Federal Energy Administration (pamphlet), January, 1977.

"Tips for Energy Savers," Energy Research and Development Administration and Federal Energy Administration (pamphlet), August, 1977.

N.B.: a plethora of material is available, but very little of it is theoretically focused. Exploratory, descriptive, even analytical in nature , it does not provide mechanisms for criticism and therefore may not contribute to a knowledge base. Much work needs to be done cross-checking models and general propositions with theoretical hypotheses from the physical, biological and social sciences.

Newspaper and newsmagazines are purposely excluded from this bibliography.